



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,374	01/30/2004	Masato Minami	1232-5270	7922
27123	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			DINH, JACK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(A) EJ

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/769,374	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MINAMI, MASATO	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jack Dinh	<b>Art Unit</b> 2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>DETAILED ACTION</u>                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US Patent 6,400,492) in view of Ikeda et al. (US Patent 6,897,996).

Regarding claim 1, Morita (figure 1A) is interpreted as disclosing an electrophoretic display comprising a substrate 1, a first electrode and a second electrode 50 supported the substrate, and microcapsules 4 each containing a dispersion liquid comprising (see figure 11A) a dispersion medium 104 and two species of electrophoretic particles 102 and 103 different in charge polarity and color are disposed on the second electrode, wherein the first and second electrodes are disposed so as to create an electric field along a surface of the substrate and are to be supplied with a voltage so as to move the two species of electrophoretic particles in mutually opposite directions along the electric field to effect display (see figures 11A-C). Morita is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations except for an insulation layer disposed between the first electrode and the second electrode. Disposing an insulation layer between two electrodes is a common practice to clearly define the electrode regions. Within the same field of endeavor, Ikeda (figure 1) is interpreted as disclosing this teaching of an insulation layer 8

Art Unit: 2873

disposed between the first electrode 6 and the second electrode 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an insulator layer between the two electrodes, as taught by Ikeda, for the purpose clearly defining the electrode regions.

Regarding claim 2, Morita (figure 1A) is interpreted as further disclosing that both of the first and second electrodes are disposed on the surface of the substrate.

Regarding claim 3, Morita (figure 1A) is interpreted as further disclosing that the first electrode is disposed on the surface of the substrate and the second electrode is disposed between adjacent microcapsules.

Regarding claim 4, Morita is interpreted as further disclosing that the colors of the two species of electrophoretic particles are white and black and the display effects white and black display (col. 7, lines 47-65; col. 6, lines 37-39).

2. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. (US Patent 6,400,492) in view of Ikeda et al. (US Patent 6,897,996), as applied in claim 1, and further in view of Choi (US Patent 6,621,541).

Regarding claim 5, Morita in view of Ikeda is interpreted as disclosing all the claimed limitations, as described above except for a color filter. Within the same field of endeavor, Choi (figure 2) is interpreted as disclosing the teaching of known color filters 4a-c disposed above the microcapsules on the viewing side of the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2873

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the color filters, as taught by Choi, for the purpose of effecting the color display.

*Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2873

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-2327. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Y Epps can be reached on 571-272-2328. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jack Dinh

  
Georgia Epps  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800